1 2 3 4	SCOTT N. SCHOOLS (SC 9990) United States Attorney JOANN M. SWANSON (CSBN 88143) Chief, Civil Division MELANIE L. PROCTOR (CSBN 228971) Melanie.Proctor@usdoj.gov Assistant United States Attorney	
5 6	450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36055 San Francisco, California 94102-3495 Telephone: (415) 436-6730 FAX: (415) 436-7169	
7	Attorneys for Defendants	
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION	
11	PADAM GIRI,	No. C 07-5219 JCS
12	Plaintiff)	
13	v.)	
14 15	ROBERT MUELLER, III, Director, Federal) Bureau of Investigation; et al,	PROPOSED ORDER
16	Defendants.	
17	PROPOSED ORDER	
18	Plaintiff asks the Court to compel Defendants to adjudicate his application for asylum	
19	However, Congress has explicitly forbidden such legal actions. In addition, Defendants Mueller and	
20	Mukasey are not properly named in this action. Accordingly, the Complaint is dismissed for lack	
21	of subject matter jurisdiction.	
22	Plaintiff asserts that under 8 U.S.C. § 1158(d)(5)(A)(iii), he has a right to have his	
23	application decided within 180 days after the date he filed his application. Complaint, p. 6 ¶ 40.	
24	However, the same statute provides that	
25		
26	[n]othing in this subsection shall be construed to create any substantive or procedural right or benefit that is legally enforceable by any party against the United States or its agencies or officers or any other person.	
27 28	8 U.S.C. § 1158(d)(7). Mandamus relief is only available where the plaintiff establishes a clear and	
	PROPOSED ORDER C 07-5219 JCS	1

certain claim, and the existence of a nondiscretionary duty that is free from doubt. <u>Kildare v. Saenz</u>, 325 F.3d at 1084.

Moreover, the United States, as sovereign, can be sued only to the extent that it has consented to be sued. <u>United States v. Sherwood</u>, 312 U.S. 584, 586 (1941); <u>Gilbert v. DaGrossa</u>, 756 F.2d 1455, 1458 (9th Cir. 1985). Here, Congress has explicitly proscribed against Plaintiff's action. 8 U.S.C. § 1158(d)(7). Accordingly, the Court lacks subject matter jurisdiction, and the Complaint shall be dismissed pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(1). <u>Vang v. Gonzales</u>, 237 Fed. Appx. 24, 31 (6th Cir. 2007) (holding a fourteen year delay in processing petitioners' asylum applications did not deny them due process rights, taking note of § 1158(d)(7)); <u>Gjeluci v. Chertoff</u>, 2005 WL 1801989, at *1 (E.D. Mich. July 27, 2005) (finding that § 1158(d)(7) expressly precludes a finding that a clear nondiscretionary duty exists).

In addition, Defendants Mueller and Mukasey are not properly named as defendants. Since March 1, 2003, the Department of Homeland Security ("DHS") has been the agency responsible for implementing the Immigration and Nationality Act. See 6 U.S.C. §§ 271(b)(5), 557. Thus, the only relevant Defendants here are those within the DHS, and Defendants Michael B. Mukasey and Robert S. Mueller should be dismissed. See Clayton v. Chertoff, et al., No. 07-cv-02781-CW, slip. op., at 4-7 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 1, 2007); Konchitsky v. Chertoff, No. C-07-00294 RMW, 2007 WL 2070325, at *6-7 (N.D. Cal. July 13, 2007); Dmitriev v. Chertoff, No. C 06-7677 JW, 2007 WL 1319533, at *4 (N.D. Cal. May 4, 2007).

The Complaint is hereby DISMISSED, with prejudice. IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date:

JOSEPH C. SPERO
United States Magistrate Judge